Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?	It all went by too fast. Print material was needed, later provided by website					
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	Yes		No	No	No	No
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	I do not know, and local residents refuse to respond to me, what the special problems for my area, Toole, are.I have to work from my SLC info.					
Have you already developed your constituent group?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?	10		5	5	10	7
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?	4		1	1	1	1
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		3	1	5	4
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3		3	1	5	4
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		3	1	5	3
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by media	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed using DAQ website or publications
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?			Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by personal or professional interest	Other	Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?			Informed by media	Informed using DAQ website or publications		
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?			Other	Other		
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?	I am not sure it's effective. One of my three groups has prejudices I had to fight, the other one was interested and opinionated, and the third group didn't much care.					
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Area		Mobile	Mobile		
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Mobile		Point	Point		
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Point		Area	Area		
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	No		No	Yes		
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	They're all smart and educated and knew what I meant.					
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	60+ min		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	60+ min		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	Yes		Yes	No		
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.						
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed by personal or professional interest		EPA list provided to workgroups	EPA list provided to workgroups		
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Independent research		Independent research	Informed by personal or professional interest		
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Informed using DAQ website or publications	Independent research		
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed using DAQ website or publications		
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Other	Other		
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?	more, better, more dependable transit.		Improved Vehicle emission Technology	Incentives for alternative fuels vehicles		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		4	3		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		4	5		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		4	3		

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	1		4	4		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5		4	3		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5		3	3		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		4	4		
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?	driving less, less idling, better announcements for bad AQ were pretty much "the rest of the story."		continue and Expanded vehicle emission Testing	Residential wood stove change out program		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5	4		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		5	5		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2		5	4		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4		5	4		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			5	4		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3		4	4		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5		5	4		
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?	see above, there were no discernable differences in that group. They all agreed it would be a good idea to drive less, and no one does it. The Third category included getting rid of Kennecott, not believing me, etc.		Increased Transit Ridership with Expanded Service	Diesel engine retrofits		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	1		4	3		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5		4	4		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	1		4	2		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	1		4	3		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			3	4		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			3			
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			3	3		
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?			Expand UDOT Signal Timing Efforts	Repair assistance for low-income owners of poorly maintained vehicles		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	2		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	5		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	3		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	2		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			4	3		

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			4	3		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			4	3		
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?			continue vanpool efforts	Alternative fuels tax credit		
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	3		
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	5		
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	4		
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	3		
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			4	3		
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			4	3		
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			4	4		
What time of day is best to meet?	Either	Either	Afternoon	Morning		
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.	Time to do the needed work, sometimes is less, sometimes is more.					
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	No	No	No	No		
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	Impossible to divide out responses in the way the survey requests. Most agreed to what I wrote #1 and then a group of ideas, and then disbelieved me as to industrial causes. Get rid of Kennecott and refineries, but keep refineries so we have gas....total input on that.					